REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,128,279 (hereinafter O'Neil et al.) in view of Barrera et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,748,448 (hereinafter Barrera et al.). Claim 1 is amended to bring it into better form.

Applicant respectfully submits the cited references do not teach, suggest or disclose "[a] method of accessing data from a plurality of servers comprising: ... *adding an identity of the first server to the data and forwarding the data to the client computer*" (e.g., as described in the embodiment of claim 1).

Applicant agrees with the Office Action's assessment that O'Neil does not disclose adding an identity of the first server to the data and forwarding the data to the client computer. *See* Office Action, page 7. It claims Barrera discloses receiving a request for network content and modifying the URL, *such that the URL request resource file physical I/O address is preferably embedded* in the client computer browser page URL link (citing column 4 lines 10-50, column 8 lines 50-65, column 9 lines 1-10). Applicant respectfully disagrees; as shown below, disclosure of *a physical I/O address of a resource file* does not disclose *adding an identity of the first server* to the data and forwarding the data to the client computer as specifically recited in the claims.

The first portions of this section merely disclose using a URL addressing scheme for efficiently accessing resource files on a networked server system. *See* Column 4, lines 10-25. As asserted by the Office Action, this section further discloses: "The URL request resource file physical I/O address is preferably embedded in the client computer browser page URL link, pre-

establishing a correspondence between the browser page element and the resource file." *See* Column 4, lines 25-29. However, as argued above this section does not disclose the relevant limitations as recited in the embodiment of claim 1. The last portion of the cited section discloses:

> In the system embodiment of the present invention corresponding to this method embodiment, the data storage device controller is directly connected to the network and has a destination IP address, to allow accessing the requested resource file on the data storage device directly, *and to allow the transfer of the requested resource file*, between the data storage device and the client network access equipment, *to be directly performed by the data storage device controller. (emphasis added)*

Interestingly, this section of the Barrera reference does not disclose *the use of a server* to perform the transfer of the requested file, much less the adding of an identity of a first server to a data request return as claimed in multiple embodiments.

An examination of the introductory section (column 8, lines 30-40) to the Office Action's cited section of column, lines 50-65 explains why. The cited section column 8, lines 50-65 discloses some of the steps of the requesting and retrieval of data according to Barrera wherein "...a physical I/O address is included in the complete URL address" without any further explanation of the embedding process. *See* column 8, lines 40-44. However, the introductory section referred to above discloses:

> In another preferred embodiment of the present invention, shown in FIG. 3, *the function of returning the resource file to the client 100 is directly performed by the data storage device controller 102, and a URL includes a physical I/O address of a resource file.* In this aspect of the invention the resource file is sent directly to the requesting client, *without use of a server 104.* For this purpose the data storage device controller 102 protocol, such as SCSI or IDE protocol is used and the data storage device controller 102 is directly connected, via connection 108 and LAN connection 112, to the internet 106, and has its own IP address. (*emphasis* added)

Therefore, this introductory section makes it clear that the retrieval of any requested file is performed by a data storage device controller, separate from any server. Barrera specifically teaches away from the use of a server. Therefore, it is clear that the that the embedded physical I/O address of a resource file does not include an identity of a server responsible for forwarding the requested data to the client computer (e.g. as described in the embodiment of claim 1), because Barrera does not require the use of servers at all in its retrieval process.

The last cited section of Barrera (column 9, lines 1-10) merely confirms this conclusion. It restates: "In this preferred embodiment of the present invention, the host server 104 and the stack are bypassed. The data storage device controller 102 incorporates the Web network interface to interpret the request and return the requested resource file." *See* column 9, lines 5-9. Therefore, it is clear that Barrera and O'Neil are inadequate to disclose at least relevant limitations of the embodiment of claim 1.

Applicant maintains that embedded address of Barrera is inadequate in other ways as well. As shown in multiple instances above, the embedded address of Barrera is a physical I/O address, otherwise known as a MAC address or ethernet address (e.g., 00 0A 27 91 40 FC). A MAC is not the same as, for example, an IP identifying address. A MAC address is a hardware address used for interface with the network medium in the OSI network standard. Applicant submits a MAC address is not sufficient to disclose an identity of a first server as specifically recited in the embodiment of claim 1.

The Office Action also asserts that because column 8, lines 5-10 of Barrera discloses that while responding to client requests, the IP address of a *device controller* is embedded in the URL

request, that this is the equivalent of *adding an identity of the first server* to the data and forwarding the data to the client computer. Applicant disagrees. Column 8, lines 5-10 of Barrera state:

> In this preferred embodiment of the present invention *a URL address has the following content*, assuming contiguous storage of resource file blocks:
>
> http://.....*<IP Address or Hostname of Controller>*/<LUN#>/<StartBlock#>,<NumberOfBlocks>
>
> In the disclosed preferred embodiment, *the URL identifies a specific data storage device controller and its logical unit number,* a physical block start address of the resource file on the data storage device and a number of blocks used for the resource file, and thus step 6 of a conventional system is bypassed. *(emphasis added)*

Therefore, as described in the Barrera reference "a URL address has the following content": the *identity of a specific data storage device controller* and its logical unit number (italicized in the exemplary URL), a physical block start address of the resource file on the data storage device and a number of blocks used for the resource file.

Moreover, even if Applicants were to assume, only *arguendo*, that the identity of the controller and the server are the same (they may not be), there is nothing in the Barrera reference that teaches "...adding an identity of the first server *to the data* and forwarding the data to the client computer", as described in embodiments of the present application. Column 7, line 25 to column 8, line 10 of Barrera (including the cited section column 8, line 5-10) is intended to describe the request and transfer of a resource file between computers. *See* column 7, lines 25-26. This description includes the selection and subsequent of *sending* of a requested URL address. *See* column 7, lines 55-63. Therefore, the URL address cited by the Office Action is merely *sent* as an identifier to aid in the locating of the requested resource file stored on the

"Web server host". *See* column 7, lines 64-67.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the cited URL address of Barrera is *sent* as part of an instruction request sent to the *host server* to *initiate the locating* of the requested file. Barrera does not disclose at least including an URL address as part of a *retrieval* process to be sent to *the requesting party*, and definitely does not include a description of "... *adding an identity of the first server to the data* and forwarding the data *to the client computer*" as described in embodiments of the present application. In order to support a proper §103(a) rejection, the cited references must include a similar teaching, suggestion or description. The Barrera reference does not.

Therefore, since each and every element of claim 1 is not taught, suggested or disclosed by the cited references, Applicant respectfully submits that the §103(a) rejections are lacking and should be withdrawn. Likewise, independent claims 8 and 15 include similar limitations. Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-20 depend from and further define allowable independent claims 1, 9, and 15, and therefore are allowable as well.

For at least the above reasons, it is believed that this Response places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Response is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600.**

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: April 17, 2006 By: _____
Sumit Bhattacharya
(Reg. No. 51,469)
Attorneys for Intel Corporation

Customer No. 25693

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501

84896